Appl. No.: 10/676,863 Amdt. Dated: 7/18/2006

Reply to Office Action of: 03/20/2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 remained in this application. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended, claims 5, 7 and 10 have been canceled. New claim 31 has been added. Claims 11-30 have been withdrawn in response to the restriction requirement, but without prejudice to Applicants' right to present such claims in continuing applications.

1. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1-2 and 4-10 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by DeAngelis et al. (US 4,888,317).

Respectfully, the rejection is traversed. Claim 1 has been amended to clearly distinguish DeAngelis by clarifying that the structure of the body in the present invention is a <u>ceramic</u>, whereas DeAngelis is directed to a *metal* (emphasis added). Examiner is directed to Col. 7 wherein it is indicated that the structure is formed from 72% iron and 28% of an iron-aluminum alloy. Accordingly, the material is substantially different than claimed in the present application. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion in DeAngelis of the desirability or how to achieve such a ceramic structure. Additionally, there is no discussion of the CTE of the DeAngelis material. However, there is reason to believe that because it is a metal, i.e., an iron alloy, that it would have a CTE on the order of iron, that is about 12 x 10⁻⁶/°C. In contrast, the present invention has a CTE of less than 1.5 x 10⁻⁶/°C, roughly an order of magnitude lower. Accordingly, Applicant's believe the rejection is traversed.

2. Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Examiner is thanked for the indication of allowability of claim 3. Claims 3 has been amended herein and rewritten in independent form. Preamble language has been deleted for clarity.

3. New Claims

New claim 31 has been added. Claim 31 is allowable for at least the reasons given above, i.e., that the prior art fails to teach or suggest a ceramic honeycomb substrate comprising a ceramic body having an inlet end, an outlet end, a multiplicity of cells with walls defined by a thickness of a thickness in the range of 2.5 mil (0.0025 in., 0.0635 mm) to 7 mil (0.0070 in., 0.1778 mm), a total porosity in the range of 50% to 65%, a median pore size in the range of 2-10 micrometers, and a coefficient of thermal expansion (CTE) (25-800 °C) of less than 15×10^{-7} /°C. No new matter is added.

Appl. No.: 10/676,863 Amdt. Dated: 7/18/2006

Reply to Office Action of: 03/20/2006

4. Conclusion

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, Applicants believe the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants believe that a **one** (1) **month extension of time** is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should Applicants be in error, Applicants respectfully request that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Randall S. Wayland at 607-974-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7-18-06

Randall S. Wayland Attorney for Assignee Reg. No. 36,303 Corning Incorporated SP-TI-03-1 Corning, NY 14831